

REMARKS

Claim Changes

Claim 18 and 29 are amended to clarify that the image capture corresponds to inversion or rotation of a “display.” The support for the amendment can be found at least on page 11, lines 5-12 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (b) as being unpatentable over US Pat No. 6,707,581 (Browning) in view of US Publ. No. 2004/0201595A1 (Manchester) and US Pat. No. 7,305,146 (Cheatle)

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (b) as being unpatentable over Browning in view of Manchester and Cheatle as herein amended.

Independent claim 18, as amended, describes a mobile scanning terminal system having an image capture component that captures optical signals related to a product, the capture corresponds to inversion or rotation of a display, an image analysis component that analyzes and determines product identity based at least in part upon the optical signals, and the display that displays information associated with the product and inverts or rotates the information to an optimal viewing orientation, regardless of the orientation of the system, thereby efficiently relaying data to the user.

Applicant respectfully submits that Browning, Manchester, and Cheatle, individually and in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 18 as amended. For example, independent claim 18 as amended recites “an image capture component that captures optical signals related to a product, the *capture* corresponds to inversion

or rotation of a *display*” which is not taught or suggested in either Browning, Manchester, or Cheatle.

Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that the *capture* corresponds to inversion or rotation of a “*display*.” However, Cheatle in col. 6, lines 39-50 indicates that an optical lens system which is held at an angle captures an image. A tilt sensor present in the optical system determines the angle at which a camera is held and based on the determined angle, an image processor crops the image to correct the tilt of the original image. Therefore, Cheatle at best proposes that the capture corresponds to the tilt of the camera. However, Cheatle fails to disclose that the capture corresponds to the tilt of the display.

Also, Manchester in paragraph [0034] describes that in response to determining the orientation of a viewer’s head, the display image is automatically oriented. Therefore, Manchester at best rotates or inverts the display image according to the orientation of the viewers head, but Manchester fails to disclose that the capture corresponds to inversion or rotation of a display. Further, Applicant has carefully reviewed Browning, and found that Browning also fails to disclose Applicant’s claimed feature. Therefore, because of the above mentioned reasons Cheatle, Manchester, and Browning, individually or in combination, fail to disclose “an image capture component that captures optical signals related to a product, the *capture* corresponds to inversion or rotation of a *display*” as recited in the independent claims 18, 29, and 37.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 18, 29, and 37 are not obvious in view of Cheatle, Manchester, and Browning, and therefore that the rejection of independent claims 18, 29, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) in view of Cheatle, Manchester, and Browning should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 19-28, and 30-36 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 18 and 29. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of claims 18-37 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant’s claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any

questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Date 7/27/09

Motorola, Inc.
One Motorola Plaza
Holtsville, NY 11742-1300
(631) 738-3405
BJD:dj:i

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Bartholomew J. Di Vita
Attorney For Applicant
Registration No.: 59,803